Applicant: Jon R. Lesniak
Application No.: 10/039,218
Art Unit: 2872

Remarks

Claims 1–22 remain pending in the application. In the Office Action dated April September 24, 2003, the examiner rejected claims 1–3, 8–16 and 20–22 as obvious over *Sharp et al.* in view of *Le Floch et al.* Claims 4 and 17 were rejected as obvious over *Sharp et al.* in view of *Le Floch et al.* and further in view of *West.* Claims 5–7, and 18–19 were rejected as obvious over *Sharp et al.* in view of *Le Floch et al.*, and further in view of *"Polarized Light"*.

The courtesy extended to applicant's counsel by Examiners Pritchett and Dunn in the telephone interview conducted November 24, 2003, is acknowledged with appreciation.

During the interview, the references which form the basis for the rejection of the claims were discussed. It was agreed that none of the references anticipate any of the claims. It was the examiners' position that with respect to claims 1 and 15 that a motivation was present to combine the references in a way which would inherently meet the limitations of claims 1 and 15. Applicant first drew the examiners' attention to the limitations of claim 11 which require a specific relationship between the optical elements which is not suggested in the references. It was agreed that claim 11 distinguished over the references. It was further agreed that claim 6 was allowable if rewritten in independent form. It was suggested that the relationship of the optical elements as set forth in claim 11 be incorporated into claim 1, and 15. Applicant has amended claim 1 to claim changing the eccentricity of the elliptically polarized light of every wavelength of the polychromatic light source which is not the selected wavelength, to a value opposite in sign and equal to that produced by a 1/4 wave plate.

Claim 15 has been amended to include introducing a first wavelength-dependent error with a ½ wave plate which is twice as great, and of opposite sign as a second wavelength dependent error, produced by a 1/4 wave plate defined with respect to a selected wavelength, and a means for reducing the first wavelength-dependent error to equal the second wavelength dependent error in magnitude.

Claim 15 thus has also been amended to incorporate the agreed-upon distinction between

9

Applicant: Jon R. Lesniak
Application No.: 10/039,218
Art Unit: 2872

the invention and the prior art. Typographical errors have been corrected in claims 14 and 21.

It should be understood that the claims are not limited to a perfect circular polarizer as various optical errors are invariably present in any optical system. For example, the specification describes a device built by applicant which has a less than one percent noncircularity.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

_____
Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt2.res/amdt

10